



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/594,495

11/07/2006

Tadahiro Ohmi

039262-0163

3794

22428 7590 04/25/2011

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

ZERVIGON, RUDY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1716

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/25/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/594,495	Applicant(s) OHMI ET AL.	
	Examiner Rudy Zervigon	Art Unit 1716	

All Participants:

(1) Rudy Zervigon.

(2) Thomas G. Bilodeau.

Date of Interview: 21 April 2011

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Status of Application: After Final Rejection

(3) Parviz Hassanzadeh.

(4) _____.

Time: 10:00

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
112, 1st paragraph

Claims discussed:
1

Prior art documents discussed:
None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The attendants discussed the Examiner's sole pending 112, 1st paragraph rejections. Regarding the 112 rejection under the "directing means coupled...", TB stated that gas ejection portions 37/34 is/are the components meeting the claimed features. The Examiner agreed to such an interpretation only under the condition that the qualifying "coupled to" clause is used in a general sense (as supported by Figure 26) and not in a literal sense where the directing means and the evaporation mechanism would be expected to have a common interfacing surface which is not supported by Applicant's Figure 26. Regarding the second 112 rejection, PH stated that the newly submitted Figure 41 shows Applicant's evaporation mechanism 135 as "part" of the container 125 and is not necessarily "outside said container" as claimed. RZ agreed with PH. TB stated that he would take the results of today's interview to Applicant along with suggestions on course(s) of action.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

See attached advisory action
/Rudy Zervigon/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1716

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)